UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Government,

HONORABLE GEORGE CARAM STEEH

v.

No. 16-20098

KHALIL ABU-RAYYAN,

Defendant.

SENTENCING HEARING

Monday, March 13, 2017

- - -

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: RONALD W. WATERSTREET, ESQ.

Assistant U.S. Attorney

For the Defendant: TODD A. SHANKER, ESQ.

- - -

To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact:
Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 238
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 962-1234

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

	2:16	cr-20098-GCS	S-RSW	Doc # 118	File	ed 05	5/17	/17	Pg 2 of 49	Pg ID 1214	1
											2
1	-			I	N	D	E	x			
2	2										_Page
3	3	Sentencing	heari	ng							4
4	Ŀ										
5	5										
6	5										
7											
8											
9	)										
10	)										
11	-										
12	2										
13	3										
14	<u> </u>										
15	5										
16	5										
17	7										
18	3										
19	)										
20	)										
21	-										
22	2										
23	3										
24	Ł										
25	5										

1		E	X	н	В	I	Т	S
_		_			_	_	_	_

2	<u>Identification</u>	Offered	Received
3	Defense Exhibit A	19	
4	Defense Exhibit B	26	
5	Government Exhibit 1	40	
6	Government Exhibit 3	42	
7	Government Exhibit 4	45	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
	I <b>I</b>		

16-20098; USA v. KHALIL ABU-RAYYAN

Detroit, Michigan 1 2 Monday, March 13, 2017 3 4 THE CLERK: Case Number 16-20098, United 5 States of America versus Khalil Abu-Rayyan. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon. 8 MR. WATERSTREET: Good afternoon, your Honor. 9 Ronald Waterstreet on behalf of the United States. 10 THE COURT: Welcome. 11 MR. SHANKER: Good afternoon. Todd Shanker on behalf of Mr. Khalil Abu-Rayyan who is standing to my 12 13 left. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. This is the date and time established for 15 sentencing in the case. The Court has had the opportunity 16 17 to review the sentencing memoranda submitted by both 18 sides, along with the Pre-Sentence Investigation Report, 19 and there are a few issues that may go to the question of 2.0 the guideline calculation that I understand needs to be 21 resolved, is that right? 22 MR. SHANKER: Yes, your Honor. We would 23 stand by the objections that I filed in writing. I have 24 nothing to add to that, but we did object to the two point 25 enhancement for possession of three additional guns on

16-20098; USA v. KHALIL ABU-RAYYAN

November 15, 2015, and we do object to not receiving the final acceptance point, because Mr. Rayyan has been complying throughout the proceedings, and I don't understand why he is not getting that third point.

THE COURT: Okay. As it relates to the first argument, the three firearms, this deals with one of the sentencing factors in relation to the charges in Count 2, is that right, possession of a firearm by a prohibited person?

MR. SHANKER: That's correct, your Honor.

**THE COURT:** Okay. Mr. Waterstreet?

MR. WATERSTREET: Your Honor, we filed a response. I think Probation Department made a recommendation to the Court concerning our response, that the three additional firearms actually involved one firearm in which he has a photograph of himself holding a firearm that predated this particular offense, two other firearms post-dated this offense, in which he was possessing an AK-47 and an AR-15, and there was an additional handgun that he used during his concealed pistol license class.

So there were actually five guns involved, plus the additional gun that he attempted to purchase shortly after he was arrested and tried to buy another gun again.

So any number of those guns or combination of

those guns clearly meet the requirement that he should get two additional enhancement points.

THE COURT: As it relates to the firearm with the -- that appeared in the photograph, that was an AR --

MR. WATERSTREET: One was an AK-47, and there's another picture he posted that was an AR-15. Those are both on the same day, November 17th.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SHANKER: Your Honor, if I could respond. I don't think the count of the number of guns is correct there. He was given two additional points for three additional firearms. One, they all occurred on the same day, November 15th. He attempted to buy a gun at a sporting goods store on that day, and again, he was not charged with any crime at this point, and that application did not go through. He did not get the gun, but he did attempt later that day, the same day that he was taking a CPL class.

At the CPL class, there was an AK and an AR that were rented on the range, and one of them actually didn't work, and that's why they ended up getting the second one, but they did possess those firearms on that day for a brief period of time, but it's three additional firearms. I'm not sure what these other guns are that the prosecutor is referring to.

2.0

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Waterstreet?

MR. WATERSTREET: Your Honor, three

additional guns. Four total is enough for the two point enhancement.

THE COURT: And the -- if one of those was not operable, would that make a difference?

MR. WATERSTREET: No.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well, probation also recommends that the Court apply the enhancement based upon the facts that were known. I think it is appropriate under those circumstances, and we'll side with the application of that enhancement, which would leave us with a -- before dealing with the one level for acceptance and responsibility that has not been awarded, the Court will conclude -- I guess I should address that first.

Mr. Waterstreet, what's your response to that?

MR. WATERSTREET: Your Honor, the guideline section which we are referring to for acceptance of responsibility is very clear. It's only upon the motion of the United States for that third point that the defendant is entitled to it, and the case law is rather clear on whether the only way in which the Court can find that it is inappropriate, is if the United States relies upon unconstitutional reasons for denying that, and in

2.0

the -- and there's nothing unconstitutional about the reason why the United States is denying this is because of the additional amount of additional time the United States had to -- and this Court -- had to involve itself in in the resolution of this matter.

We had two detention hearings -- actually three detentions hearing altogether, one before the magistrate and two before your Honor -- and they were very lengthy. The United States had to prepare as it similarly as it would for trial for examination of their experts they chose to put on, and the United States ended up filing a pretrial motion anticipating trial before the defendant entered his guilty plea.

So those are a number of difference reasons why the third point is not applicable.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WATERSTREET: And I believe the Probation

Department found that -- made that finding as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Any other argument, Mr. Shanker on that?

MR. SHANKER: Your Honor, I would just say that Mr. Rayyan has not caused any delay. He did the work. There was one bond motion after the case initially came to your Honor, and the government sought to have him examined by a forensic examiner for a lengthy period of

time, 24 hours a day, and he underwent that examination for several months. He came back, and we sought a bond again, but we didn't file any substantive motions, and I was in plea negotiations with Mr. Waterstreet as soon as he came back from Massachusetts from the BOP.

So I don't understand why that point is being withheld, and even now within two days after his bond hearing, we contacted the Court and said he's going to plead guilty.

So I really -- I've never dealt with a situation where a point has been withheld under these circumstances, but Mr. Waterstreet is correct that it is within his discretion. It's my position that it's an abuse of discretion.

THE COURT: All right. I think he's made out a -- by his virtue of the statement, that is

Mr. Waterstreet, that explains his reasoning. Whether we agree with it or not, I think it is within the discretion of the government to withhold the point for timely acceptance, and the Court will, therefore, apply that point that as well, which raises the guideline range to a range of 15 to 21 months.

MR. WATERSTREET: That's my understanding.

MR. SHANKER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And so the Court will adopt that

16-20098; USA v. KHALIL ABU-RAYYAN

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

first --

as the quideline range that the Court should consider in determining an appropriate sentence in this case, along with those factors that are enumerated in Section 3553(a), and Mr. Shanker would you like to address those factors? MR. SHANKER: Yes, your Honor. Could I please get the shackles removed for Mr. Rayyan, or at least the belly shackles? I mean, he wants to make a statement to the Court, and he's got papers that he wants to hold. I was wondering if we could get at least the belly shackle removed? THE COURT: Does he have them around the ankles as well? THE MARSHAL: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: How about it? Are you comfortable with the ideal of removing them? THE MARSHAL: We can remove one. **THE COURT:** Okay. MR. SHANKER: Thank you. MR. WATERSTREET: In the interim, can the Court inquire whether the defendant had the opportunity to review the Pretrial Services Report, and whether there is any other objections that he has beyond the two that's been raised by counsel? THE COURT: Mr. Shanker to address it

MR. SHANKER: Sure, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: -- and I'll address it to the 3 defendant. MR. SHANKER: Mr. Rayyan and I did review the 4 PSR. We have no additional objections. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rayyan, you heard 7 your lawyer indicate that you reviewed the Pre-Sentence 8 Investigation Report with your attorney? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And there are no other objections 11 that you're aware of at this point? 12 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right. Go a head. 14 MR. SHANKER: Thank you, your Honor. 15 As you just stated, Judge, you calculated the guideline range of 15 to 21 months, and just so we don't 16 17 lose focus here, I want to state that he pled guilty to 18 making a false statement about his use of marijuana while 19 trying to obtain a firearm, and then obtaining that 20 firearm. This is the same gun that he's also been 21 connected for at the state level, and he was punished for 22 two years probation on that, and again, this was 23 possession for two days, October 5th through October 7,

16-20098; USA v. KHALIL ABU-RAYYAN

Despite the guideline of 15 to 21 months, the

2015. That's how long he was possessed that gun.

24

25

government is asking for a sentence of eight years based on its contention that Mr. Rayyan is a terrorist, and your Honor, the government's request makes it appear that this is a very difficult sentencing decision, and your Honor, I don't think it is as difficult as it appears, because when we look at actual facts of the case that have been proven, when we compare this case to other cases in this district, and we look at the opinions of the mental health experts in this case, including the government's own expert, and his extraordinarily detailed evaluation, when we look at all of that, this case is not as difficult as it might appear, because Mr. Rayyan is not a terrorist. He never intended to hurt anybody, and the great weight of the evidence supports that.

The government's request for a variance in this case, if granted, would gut the core principles of the Constitution as they apply to Mr. Rayyan, including the right to be presumed innocent, the right to due process, both substantive and procedural due process, and the right to a jury trial.

The government is asking for a sentence where the sentencing tail would wag the charging dog, and the Supreme Court for over 30 years has said that we have to look these cases with extreme caution because of the possible violation of rights, and that's goes all the way

back to McMillian versus Pennsylvania in 1985.

Your Honor, Mr. Rayyan was an immature young man, who made poor decisions, made foolish and scary comments to an undercover agent who poses a love interest, and engaged in reckless attention seeking behavior online, and he is remorseful as can be about that, and I think the book of letters that we supplied to your Honor show how much thought he has put into his actions, and how much they embarrassed his family, his religion, himself, but he is absolutely not a terrorist or an attempted terrorist, and there is no proof to support that beyond a preponderance of the evidence or clear and convincing evidence.

Now, the first thing that I want to point out is that the Probation Department's guideline range was 15 to 21 months. Probation did not find that there was any relevant conduct that warranted an upward departure. So they found there was no preponderance of the evidence to warrant that departure. The report specifically states this is in Paragraph 92.

Not only that your Honor, they included a section that analyzed the Section 3553 factors. Not once does the report suggest that a variance would be necessary or reasonable under Section 3553, and beyond that, probation concluded that a sentence that is within the guideline

range would reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment. That's a quote.

Your Honor, I agreed to two extensions of time for the government to makes its objections in the Pre-Sentence Report. They did not object to the failure to apply a departure. They did not object to the assessment of the 3553 factors, and it is my position they've waived the argument for a variance on the basis that they are asking for it, namely that he is some sort of terrorist.

Secondly, your Honor, there's simply a failure of proof here, and when we look at variances under Section 3553, the standard is the same as the guidelines. They have to have a preponderance of evidence to show his intent, and all the evidence that we have indicates the opposite. Not just coming from his mouth, but the two experts who analyzed him and who evaluated him and who tested him. They found that he did not intend to harm anybody.

Now one of the things that Mr. Rayyan did that was disturbing in this case is that he was on the Twitter feed for ISIS, and he owns that, your Honor. He got into this initially because he was depressed. He was looking for shock in all entertainment, and he was interested in ISIS. He is not denying that, but your Honor, he never -- when

he's on Twitter, there's no evidence that he ever made any threats. He didn't join ISIS. He doesn't have any contacts at all with no one. He doesn't know anyone in ISIS. He hasn't materially supported terrorism in any way. He has not flown to Syria to train. He hasn't trained.

Your Honor, what he did on Twitter, he apologizes for, and he understands what an embarrassment that is, and how exactly how it looks. He understands that the FBI would be interested in looking at somebody who is re-tweeting violent jihadi videos.

Look, he owns that. He understands that, but your Honor, that is protected under the First Amendment. I know the government says it is not, but in U.S. v Shehadeh, S-h-e-h-a-d-e-h, a 2013 case out of the Eastern District of New York, in that case that defendant did the same things as Mr. Rayyan on the Twitter feed, but he went far beyond that. He actually set up multiple websites so that he could personally disseminate ISIS propaganda and violent execution videos to thousand of other people.

The government in that case sought an upward variance or departure based on his behavior, and the Court found that the defendant's actions were legal and protected by the First Amendment, and I'm quoting, the Court stated: The court does not find the fact that

2.0

Shehadeh created an administered website regurgitating violent jihad's propaganda to be an appropriate basis for punishment or enhancement consistent with the First Amendment.

Your Honor, looking back, Mr. Rayyan, as you know and as he stated in his video to you, he denounces ISIS. He understands now that he was -- what he was seeing was propaganda, and he understands that ISIS is basically exploiting Islam, and he has learned I think through this process, but your Honor, what he did was not illegal on Twitter.

Your Honor, the next thing that I want to talk about are the actual statements that he made that are the subject of the government's request for this massive variance.

First of all, there is a complete disconnect between his possession of the gun in October of 2015, and his statements about a church and an officer that were made months later in January 2016.

In this entire investigation, in the 10 months of investigation, he possessed a gun on exactly three days. Three days. Two were the days that he carried the .22 that he was arrested with. That's a .22. That is a six shot, single loading gun, not the kind of gun that a terrorist would use. It's manual loading, and then the

other day was November 15th, and that was when he tried to purchase the gun, a second gun, and that was because his family told him that the only way he could get a CPL was to take a class and follow the law and get the permit, because remember, he's not charged with anything at this point.

So he went to the range, and he did. At the end of the day, they rented AK-47's, he and his cousin, and they fired them for a matter of minutes with a range officer present, and that was it.

And so your Honor, I mean, when I look at that two point enhancement, I almost think under 3553, there's a basis for a variance downward, because it was very fleeting possession, and the other gun he didn't even touch, but whatever the case, the point is he never has a gun when he's making these statements. He's making these statements because he gets himself into a situation with these undercover informants posing as love interest -- and I'm going to talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

I want to take the time here because I think it is very important. When we were at our last bond hearing, Mr. Waterstreet showed a photo and admitted a photo of Khalil's father Ray holding an AK-47, and he didn't give that to me ahead of time. It happened right in court, and

it was sort of look at this. Here's -- this is the gun that he was talking about.

Your Honor, that gun we've submitted an affidavit on that. That photograph is over seven years old. It is a gun that belongs to his brother, Khalil's uncle, and Ray states under oath that Khalil has never had access to that gun, and your Honor, I think it is worth pointing out that the search warrant in this case yields nothing. They don't finding any guns. They don't find any swords, no explosives, no Anwar Awlaki tapes. The only ammunition there is at the store is one box of ammunition for the .22 that he owned for two days. That's it.

And so your Honor, I want to take this moment to talk about a case in this district and compare it. This is the case of Sebastian Gregerson. This individual was charged with possession of a destructive device with the intent to cause bodily harm. So he's actually charged with this unlike Khalil. He is also charged with unregistered possession of a destructive device. He possessed weapons of mass destruction. He had grenades. He had a machete. He had multiple AK's, 16 guns, thousands of rounds of ammunition, a book on snipper fire, and this individual, like Khalil, threatened to kill the infidels. He threatened to kill people.

This individual has signed a plea agreement with

2.0

the government with a guideline range of 37 to 46 months. Defense counsel has allowed to ask for a downward variance, and the government has preserved the right to argue for a departure of 14 months. This very scary individual is capped at 60 months.

Your Honor, there's no -- it makes no sense that the government is asking for eight years, and this person, Gregerson has a cap at five years. It makes no sense, because his case is far more scary. His intent is far more clear. He has a military cash of weapons, and I think it speaks volumes about where Mr. Rayyan's sentence should be. It should be lower than Gregerson's guidelines, significantly lower, and I want to make that point.

I want to admit to the Court as Exhibit A, Mr. Gregerson's signed plea agreement.

Your Honor, so again, I just want to point out
Mr. Gregerson stated multiple times that he intended to
kill on behalf of ISIS. He actually had contacts too. He
was involved for years with real contacts in the radical
Islamic community. So I use this case to compare with
Khalil's because I think it is important.

Now, the statements that Khalil made were not true, your Honor. They were not true threats. They weren't true. The government didn't charge him with this.

The government didn't seek a relevant conduct enhancement, and the facts surrounding this are as follows:

Khalil was a very immature 21 year old, and he comes from an Islamic home where he did not -- never had a girlfriend. He had never touched a woman, and he was desperate for love of some sort. That's what he was looking for, and I think what's important, your Honor, is to focus on the first undercover in this case who went by Ghadda, because when you look at those transcripts, your Honor, and we submitted much of them to the Court, but what I can tell you, and I can tell you from the lack of submissions by the government, this was purely a love relationship.

There's no discussions of jihad or criminal acts. They don't talk about trying to commit jihad. They actually get to know each other. They get to know about each other's family. They actually become engaged, and they're talking about -- she's supposedly an accounting major at Ohio State. They're actually talking about having her work for the family business, and Khalil's father is about to drive down to Columbus, Ohio to meet the family, when all of a sudden Ghadda disappears, and Khalil is devastated understandably. It may seem silly to us and lot of other people who have had relationships and had those connections, but he hadn't. So it was a big

deal to him, but you would think if his idea was to commit an act of terrorism, you would think he would discuss that with Ghadda, because the government learns first and foremost that he wants to be married from Ghadda and her discussions with Khalil.

So what happens is as soon as Ghadda disappears, they put in a second undercover young woman named Jannah. Jannah holds herself out as an Iraqi Sunni whose husband was murdered by anti-ISIS forces in Syria. She tells Khalil early in their conversations -- so this is late December -- she tells Khalil that she just had two close family members murdered by anti-ISIS forces in Iraq.

She holds herself out as a young girl. She says that she is 19 years old. She says that she's ready to commit jihad, but she's also very young and depressed.

So defendant's statements, they are false statements. Defendant's false statements about the church and police officer are made because they impress her, and you know what's interesting, is that the government -- there's a line in their memorandum where they say how could this possibly be flirting? But if you look at their exhibit, if you look at the exhibit involving the church statements, Jannah actually says, are you just saying this, or is it all talk just to make me smile?

So there's no question that this was encouraged,

but even more telling than the inducement here -- and your Honor, I've never in 25 years seen inducement like this, to use emotional inducement on an individual. I've seen money. I've seen other things, but I've never seen this -- but beyond all of that, the most important thing is when Jannah tries to nail him down and say to him, let's do something, because she says that she has a connect. She has a connect, and that they can get to Syria, and they can do this. Every time he says no. He even tries to talk her out of it. He says, you're young. You're impressionable. You don't know what you want. I think that speaks volumes, your Honor.

I also want to point out the government says that it intervened before Mr. Rayyan could doing something that was imminent. Your Honor, the fact is those statements, the statement about the church, that was on January 8th. The statement about the police officer, that was on January 21st. The government didn't intervene. They intervened after a February 2nd conversation phone call, and during that phone call Khalil told the undercover that he was suicidal, that he was depressed, he wanted to kill himself, and it's stunningly, the undercover says to him well, that's not good under Islam unless -- unless you make it into an act of jihad.

Khalil says I don't want to hurt anyone else. He

says that he's ill, not feeling well, and he may go to the hospital, and then within a day and a half he's arrested. So that's when the arrest occurred in this case.

I think there was great concern that Mr. Rayyan was going to talk about the undercover to people on the outside, and I think they were concerned that he was going to kill himself, but he was not agreeing to an act of jihad.

And again, your Honor, nothing -- when they searched, they found none of the things that he talked about. He said that he had an AK-47. There is no AK-47. There's no AK-47 ammunition. He said that he had piles of it. He said that he listened to Anwar Awlaki tapes. There's none. There's simply in this case no evidence that he was preparing or planning or intending to hurt anyone, and the evidence is to the contrary.

Finally, your Honor, the expert opinions in this case are unanimous, and I'm going to focus on the BOP doctor, Dr. Tillbrook, because he really did an extraordinary evaluation. It lasted over a month. They observed him 24 hours a day. They used staff to do that. He reviewed all the discovery. He reviewed all the statements, the transcripts, all the arguments that the government had made about Mr. Rayyan, and he found that first of all, that Khalil was credible, treatable and not

dangerous. He found that Mr. Rayyan did not intend to hurt anybody, but that he made these statements to this young woman because he was trying to impress her, and it's basically out of the desperation to keep this -- it was a girl. It was another woman, and he felt that he didn't want to let her.

So he continued that conversation in that way, and those statements are awful, and he owns it, but he didn't intend to hurt anybody, and I think this report is fascinating, because Dr. Tillbrook discusses -- and this is a quote -- how very uncomfortable Khalil was in these conversations as they continued.

So, I mean, we can imagine, you know, between the depression, the substance abuse, trying to avoid an arranged marriage with his family, we can see why he would say these things, and I think what's interesting in this case it started almost as a fantasy for Khalil, and by the end he found himself in this very uncomfortable position where there was a young woman saying, let's do it. Let's make it a reality, and I think it made him sick, and he refused.

So, your Honor, the experts here agreed. He didn't intend to hurt others. He's not currently a danger, but he needs help in the form of community treatment, mental health counseling and substance abuse

treatment, and Dr. Tillbrook found that that would be ideal, the dual diagnosis community treatment.

Your Honor, I've made the comparison between Mr. Gregerson's case and Mr. Rayyan's case, and it's so out of whack, this plea agreement, that it makes me wonder why it is happening, and it makes me ask is Khalil being punished for being an Arab Muslim from Dearborn as oppose to a Caucasian from the suburbs? I don't know the answer to it, but his case is night and day with Sebastian Gregerson, and there's just no logical way that his sentence should even approach Gregerson's guideline range.

Finally, your Honor, I want to discuss one other case. This is Deshawn Lanton. Mr. Lanton was an individual who was charged with going on a public Facebook page, and threatening to bomb the police funeral for Sergeant Kenneth Steil while hundreds of officers were entering the church for the funeral. That's when he made these threats.

Unlike Lanton, Mr. Rayyan never communicated a threat to try to instill fear in anyone. He made dumb, false statements to an undercover, but he didn't go and try to scare so many people. That's what Mr. Lanton did.

Mr. Lanton also illegally possessed a gun as a felon, and he ended up with Rule 11 plea agreement, and the charge that he ended up with was providing false or

misleading information with a guideline range of 15 to 21 months, and your Honor, I want to point out that the only reason it's that high is because he had three prior felony convictions.

So I want to admit -- I've marked it as Defense Exhibit B, which is the Deshawn Lanton Rule 11 plea agreement, your Honor.

So again, your Honor, I think -- I think it is pushing it to put Rayyan in the same category as Mr. Lanton, but I do think that in comparing the cases, there's certainly no need here for a sentence above the guideline range.

In conclusion, your Honor, the government has conceded that there is not a preponderance of the evidence to support relevant conduct enhancements. Whether it be terrorism, intent to cause harm, true threats, whatever it is, they have said they don't have the evidence to support it, but they are trying to back door it through Section 3553, and I think they are trying to lead this Court into a sentence that would not be constitutional, and would not be legal for the factors — for the reasons that I've discussed.

The overwhelming evidence in the case indicates that he didn't intend to hurt anybody, but he made horrible statements, and he owns it. His expression of

2.0

remorse, regret and responsibility has been extraordinary. I've never seen anything like Rayyan's letters to his family, that kind of self-reflection while locked up, and I think it speaks volumes when talking about somebody this young, because it is a developing brain, and I think he learned a lot through this process. You can see it in those letters.

For all of these reasons, your Honor, I'm requesting a sentence of 15 months. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shanker.

Mr. Waterstreet, on behalf of the government?

MR. WATERSTREET: Do you want to hear from the defendant or me first?

THE COURT: You first.

MR. WATERSTREET: Okay. Your Honor, because Mr. Rayyan continues to present a danger to the community, the government thinks a sentence of at least 96 months would be appropriate, and as the Supreme Court said in Williams versus New York, the defendant's sentence should fit the offender, not merely the crime for which he is charged and convicted of.

And as we've gone through and we've already properly calculated the guidelines, that is just the initial benchmark. In the post-Booker world that we live in, your Honor, that is just a benchmark that the Court

can look to, and it's not necessarily reasonable in and of itself if the Court says I'm going to give a guideline range because it is the guideline range. We look at factors under 3553, and there are four circumstances in which are the goals of 3553.

One is to protect the public and community. The second is deterrence. The third, reflect the seriousness of his conduct and show respect for the law, and the last is to provide the need and care and education.

Now actually courts are encouraged to vary upward when the defendant's guidelines do not accurately and fully reflect his conduct.

Now the defendant in this case is charged with a person -- being a prohibited person in possession of a firearm, and lying in order to obtain that firearm. It doesn't really reflect his professed desire to engage in dangerous conduct in using a different firearm, nor does it reflect the guideline at this point his attempt to rearm himself after he was -- that firearm that he purchased illegally was taken away. It did not stop him from lying once again claiming that he is not a drug user or addict. It does not reflect the practice of using the type of gun that he wants to use to commit a violent act.

There is no limitation factors under 3553 and the case law on the information concerning the background,

character and conduct of a defendant that the court may use in its sentencing, and that's embodied in 18 U.S.C.

3661, and that's because this Court is to not sentence him just on the charge, but by his conduct.

And I think I referenced a case from the Fourth Circuit, and it was a rather interesting case, in which the defendant, he was driving around Washington D.C. with a source of information and pointing out different buildings that he intended to blow up, the White House, the Capitol Building, but in the course of the investigation, the United States found out that he made a false statement, simply a false statement on an immigration document. He was charged with that immigration document. Never charged with the plans to commit violence acts against people who he doesn't know. Yet, the government sought and obtained an upward variance, and the Fourth Circuit said it was perfectly appropriate for the court to consider the defendant's actions above and beyond the crime charged.

This Court is mandated by 3553 because Congress used the word "shall," and it states under 3553(a), the courts shall impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and it is regularly upheld upward departures in guideline variances in U.S. versus Baines

and U.S. versus Bass which we put in our sentencing memorandum.

2.0

Another one is to deter the defendant from acting in the future, to deter this defendant specifically and deter others who may want to step into his shoes and engage in this type of conduct of planning out a violent act, and the government intervening just in time or too early from the defendant be charged with the terrorist act.

Now why do I say protection of the community and deterrence are important in this case? They are paramount when you consider this defendant and crime that he was charged with and the crime he intended to commit.

It is clear the defendant is dangerous. Mr. Shanker and I obviously see two different sides of a very thin pancake. He says he's nothing more than a confused individual who was suggested to engage in this activity by two women; one he claimed he only wanted to have a marriage act, and there was no chance whatsoever they even discussed engaging in any terrorist acts, but I suggest that counsel refer to the very first page. In the second contact that the defendant had with Ghadda, in which he says, after all my legal issues with the Kafir -- and Judge, we're the Kafir. We're the unbelievers -- the defendant said honestly, I'm going to do a martyrdom

operation. Totally out of the blue he comes up with this. This is the woman that he said wanted to marry, but he starts off the marriage with explaining, I want to do martyrdom operations to kill the unbelievers.

He told us what he has dreams of doing. This is not something that was suggested to him. This was not something that the government said why don't we go get a church? Why don't we go and shoot up a church? This was something that he dreamt up. How do we know this?

Because he told us this is what he dreamed about. He dreamed about jihad.

He not only thought about it, he told his family members about it. He told his brother, his father, strangers on the internet, and the undercover employee that this is what he wanted to do, engage in jihad.

He had prepared himself by looking at the carnage of others who engaged in this type of behavior. He expressed approval of others who chose such a barbaric method of killing people. He kept reminders of the carnage on his phone to inspire him to not give up on his plans. This was all before he met the undercover, or even began speaking with Ghadda or the undercover.

Now the defense has suggested that it is only crazy talk, and he really didn't mean it, but he has shown us how much thought he put into it, and coming up with a

plan. He selected a place. Not a general place, but a specific place, a place he had no connection with, or reason to destroy lives of others, but to commit a general idea, and that general idea is to commit, kill innocent people.

He had no ill-will towards these people, a particular person that patronized this church, but he desired to make a statement. It was not his church. It wasn't a church in his neighborhood, but he knew it to be one of the largest churches in Detroit with a very large congregation. He never said that he knew any people in there or visited it, but it is not a place that he passed going to and from work. As a matter of fact, it was a place that he had to go out his way to go see.

We don't know how many times he went there before he started telling people about his plan, but he did know the people in that church would not be able to defend themselves because he specifically said people are not allowed to carry guns in church. They would not be expecting this. They wouldn't be prepared to stop him. He told others that -- he told others so he can get credit for the deed. He told others that it would make the news, and how he planned to kill especially women and children, and that it would be a bloodbath. He didn't try to hide his plans.

He knew what he needed to accomplish that goal, and he was very specific in what he needed. He needed a gun, not just his small .22 that he initially purchased, but a gun that would be capable of causing mass casualties and destruction. He was going to use his AK-47, using his words. His AK-47 that carried 40 bullets, and he told how he bought the bullets, how he practiced with it, loading and unloading it, and we know that he went and practiced with an AK-47 because he had a picture of it, and he has a picture of himself giving the sign that he supports ISIS, holding the AK-47, and saying that he's ready to hunt the Sahwat, those who oppose ISIS, and I will have you note that happened on the 17th of November, long before he had his very first conversation with the undercover.

He began taking steps to complete his act. He began carrying a gun that he purchased, becoming familiar with it, the way it would feel carrying a firearm, maybe to get over the nerves when the day that he would go and shoot up that church.

While it's true that we never found the gun that he was going to use in that church, we don't know whether when his father said he took the gun away from him, whether his father gave it to somebody else because we did not find it when we executed the search of their home. We don't know if it's with another friend or family member,

or maybe we just didn't know where to look.

The defendant has said to the undercover, you know, it's really not that tough to get a gun here in Detroit. I can get one. People come to, and he stopped his sentence. It's like buying candy over here. People from the street want to sell me a gun everyday. It's not hard to get. We don't know where he picked up that AK-47 that his father took away from him. We know that he didn't buy it through a licensed firearms dealer. That's all we know, but if we listen to what the defendant says, we know a lot more.

Now he is attempting to convince this Court that this Court need not worry about protecting the community, need not worry about deterrence because I've learned my lesson, and we see it over and over in the stack of letters that he said that he submitted to his family.

Now to be honest with you, your Honor, this is kind of a twist on what we typically see in letters submitted to the Court. The vast majority of my years of practice is people who know the defendant write letters of encouragement on his behalf, asking the Court to be lenient because they know him better than the Court, and that they recommend that perhaps a break should be given. There's not one letter submitted by any of those people. The only letters are the self-serving letters by the

defendant, who knew he would have to face sentencing one day, and simply says, I've learned my lesson.

While I'm hoping that even the most unrepented person wouldn't say I've learned my lesson to not get out, because that's what defense is basically asking for, is a time served sentence. By the time we calculate the good time and the amount of time that he's been in, a 15 month sentence will allow him out, and I also assume that when I've learned my lesson means I'm not going to do it again. I'm done. I'm never going to do this again.

However, if we look at defendant's past conduct, we know him saying, I'm done, doesn't mean he's done. He lacks the self-control. And I'm sorry. I don't agree with defense counsel that he's suddenly become a boy to a man. He's a man when he went into jail, and he was a man that was making decisions leading up to the time that he went into jail because the defendant lacks self-control.

A prime example is his cell phone. Defense counsel brought up the fact that he was claiming that he wanted to commit suicide. If the Court will recall, the whole reason he was saying that he wanted to commit suicide is he feared the Detroit Police Department would -- had downloaded his images that were on his cell phone when arrested back in October 7, 2015, and because he -- and he specifically told the undercover, there's a

big difference between watching videos and downloading them, because when you're downloading them, that means you support ISIS, and that's what he was so worried about, and that's why he wanted to kill himself because he didn't want to have to face the day in which he would be held accountable for his actions of supporting ISIS, and following through with his plans.

So what did he do? He went out and bought a new phone, and what did he do after he got that new phone start? He started downloading the very same things. He can't control himself. He downloaded -- and I've provided these documents to the Court, a packet that were under seal the last time we were at a detention hearing, a detention review, and this was the large packet that had the severed heads, the dead bodies. These were all downloaded within days of him getting the new cell phone.

To say that he learned his lesson, again, your Honor, I disagree, and another example is here he is arrested with a firearm, carrying a concealed firearm, knowingly carrying a concealed firearm. The reason we know he knows it is because when he made his statement to the Detroit Police Department on the day that he was arrested, he knew where that gun was suppose to be. He realized, I made a mistake. I was suppose to put it in the trunk of my car, and that's what he says in a

handwritten statement to Detroit Police Department.

But, of course, when he goes to be sentenced in front of Judge Strong, well, you know, I've learned a lesson here, and that's relied upon what a salesman in a -- I want to make sure I get the quote right -- I just want to show you, Mr. Strong -- and he is referring to Judge Strong -- that I have good intentions. My advice to anyone who wants a firearm is to consult an attorney, not a gun store owner, implying that he got bad advice on how to handle that firearm.

But in his statement that he made on October 7, 2015, he says, I just forgot to put it— it says, I knew when I got in the car with it, I was wrong. I just forgot to put it in the trunk. I only had it for two days. So he knew what the law was the day he was arrested, but when it came time for sentencing, he implied to the judge that I've learned my lesson, and you know what? If somebody didn't give me bad advice, I probably wouldn't even be here.

He also lacks self-control. Another example is with marijuana. Now I think if I read the defense sentencing memorandum correctly, they claim he used drugs, quit drugs, used drugs and continued to use drugs. Yet, he told the Detroit Police Department and the FBI that he quit after he's arrested on October 7th and never used

drugs again. But then he has to use drugs to be able to convince this Court that he had a drug out of mind when he was talking to the undercover, but what he was saying with the undercover is the same thing he was saying long before he met the undercover.

He was even told by the Detroit Police Department that he was going to be tested when they interviewed him on November 30, 2015, and that he knew that he would be in trouble. He told Pretrial Services when he arrested that he, when he was arrested in February, he actually stopped using drugs a month ago, which would have made it January.

So he can't even stop using the drugs when he's been told that it's going to be a problem with Judge Strong if he continues to use drugs. He continued to use drugs, and he acknowledged that. He acknowledged that to the two doctors, and he acknowledged that to Pretrial Services. He has no self-control, your Honor.

So we can't rely upon him to protect the community. We can't rely upon him for deterrence, and unfortunately, your Honor, we can't rely upon his family, and I say this with some hesitation because as a father, brother, sister and stepmother, I can understand their desire to help out their loved one. I truly do. I truly do, but unfortunately, we can't rely upon them to protect the public.

For a long period of time, the family has been aware of the defendant's problems. The brother said so that he had mental problems, and he's been supporting ISIS for several years, and he talked about doing jihad and supporting terrorists. His talked sister talked about problems. His stepmother talked about issues that he had with mental problems and assaultive behavior.

Speaking of assaultive problems, we know the defendant has been involved in assaultive behavior, and he can't control himself, and it appears as if the family is unable or unwilling to do anything about it as well.

Now we know about the -- and it's in the Pre-Sentence Report about the incident when he was going to school at Starr Academy, in which he went in and told his teacher that he dreamed of bringing in a gun and shooting everybody in the class. As a result of that, he was suspended from school, had to go to counseling, and the defendant acknowledges this when he spoke to the doctor, his own doctor and Dr. Tillerson (sic), but we know that the family is not willing to intervene because his father paints a rosy picture of the defendant to their hired expert.

On Page 4 of the letter that Dr. Danuloff wrote to your Honor on March 29, 2016 -- I'll give the Court a copy of that. I've got a highlighted one as well, and I'll

mark this as Government Exhibit 1 for this hearing -second paragraph down, it begins, my interview with his
father and stepmother. Can you see that?

**THE COURT:** This is from what now?

MR. WATERSTREET: This is from a letter to your Honor of March 29, 2016 from Dr. Lyle Danuloff, and this is Lyle Danuloff informing your Honor his conversations that he had with Mr. Abu-Rayyan's father. This is Page 4. It is the second full paragraph beginning, my interview with his father.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WATERSTREET: Okay. It says, the second sentence: Mr. Rayyan Rayyan, who is the defendant's father, described Khalil as a gentle child and young man who is always well-behaved.

Skip down to the next sentence: He asserted that his son never got into any trouble -- got into trouble, and that he graduated high school without any suspensions or disciplinary actions against him.

Well, the probation officer has found otherwise, and that's in the probation report. We know through a police report that -- which is Paragraph 58 of the Pre-Sentence Report -- the defendant got into fight. The police were called. A fight with his own brother. Police were called, and those charges were dismissed after his

brother refused to pursue the charges, but in the Pre-Sentence Report, Paragraph 72, it says the school documented inappropriate conduct, including but not limited to the following: When the defendant was in school, he was incident of shoving another student, two incidents of throwing a chair against a classroom wall and at another student, verbal intimidation of another student, attempting to instigate a fight against another student, and general disruptive behavior of the class, and this, based upon the father's statement is that he is a gentle child and young man who has never had any problems with school.

We know that the family was fully aware that he supported ISIS ideas and wanted to commit violent acts, because he told the undercover employee that his father knew that he supported ISIS.

On January 28, 2016, there's a telephone call between the undercover and the defendant, and one little snippet of that conversation -- and here's an excerpt of that, and I have the audio of the Court wishes to hear that -- and I realize that I'm dragging on a little bit here, your Honor, and I apologize -- but it says, even my dad, he knows I support Dawla, which is the state known -- which references the Islamic state or ISIS. You know, he tells me everyday, you know, be careful. Watch your

postings. Be careful who you talk to, you know. I told him numerous times that I wanted to make jihad. I want to do an astarte operation, which is a martyrdom or suicide operation. I told my dad that, but he doesn't support it, of course, but he tells me all the time -- then it is unintelligible. I have to listen to him first.

So while the father doesn't necessarily wish to go out and commit jihad, he's fully aware of what the defendant's desires are, and we know that this took place because we confirmed this from a text message back and forth with the defendant in 2014. When he seized his cell phone, we were able to get his cell phone that he had with his prior -- one of his prior cell phones, and there were messages back and forth, and a text message on August 4, 2014, a message to the defendant --

MR. SHANKER: Objection. I would like to have a copy of that.

MR. WATERSTREET: Sure. I'll make that Government Exhibit Number 3.

MR. SHANKER: Where's the actual discovery you gave me, because this is something that is--

MR. WATERSTREET: Right. It is part of the discovery.

MR. SHANKER: What page of the discovery is this?

MR. WATERSTREET: I did not memorize the page of the discovery. It is part of the discovery.

Do not use internet for political views. Everyone is watching, and the defendant responds back, it's just research, educational purposes. Then keep your eyes open. Don't make stupid decisions, and then he says, I'm learning about the Haij. That's all.

Two days later he sends a message, Dawlat Al Islam Baqiyah, which basically means Islamic state everlasting.

So right after he's told don't engage in this conversation, don't make these postings, just like his dad told him -- when he said his dad has told him before when he was talking to the undercover on January 28, 2016, he says, he tells me everyday, you know, be careful. Watch your postings, and then we find the very --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I may not be understanding. The messages that start in August 2014 are coming from who?

MR. WATERSTREET: Well, your Honor, unfortunately, the information would not allow us to identify to whom was sending it to him, but what I'm saying it is consistent with his father always telling him, watch your postings, and that's why he says in that particular message watch --

MR. SHANKER: Your Honor, I object to the

admission of this exhibit. First of all, we don't have a interpreter here.

Second of all, it doesn't have any names on it at all. It doesn't say who's talking to whom. We don't know who this is, and so I object to Exhibit 3.

THE COURT: The telephone numbers here, which among those do you attribute to the defendant?

MR. WATERSTREET: The defendant is area code (313)320-5844, and the reason we know that, he makes that statement to the Detroit Police Department when he's arrested back on October 7th. So he's the one that is sending out -- he said, it's just research, educational purposes, and then on that same cell phone, he's reading, keep your eyes open. Do not make stupid decisions. He's also reading, do the not use the internet for political views. Everyone is watching.

So that is his read text message, but I'll move on, your Honor.

Further, the family knew, and did not forewarn the authorities to protect the public, because when we recovered his new phone, we found examples of him sending out pictures of the ISIS flag -- again long before he started talking to undercover employee -- photos of having a person's heat cut off to his brother. That was on October 25th, 2015, and these are part of -- the one on

October 22nd, the ISIS flag was part of Government's opposition to defendant's motion for revocation of detention order. It was Exhibit C, and I will mark it as Exhibit 4, and I will ask this Court to please move to seal -- I'm moving to seal this because of the graphic nature.

The photo that he sent his brother Adam that we found not only in the text message that was sent and the image that was sent, but also in another location on his phone -- and I apologize to the Court. This is what the defendant felt was important to tell his brother he wanted to do on October 25, 2015.

THE COURT: Hold on for just a second.

MR. WATERSTREET: I know I'm probably causing you to run late on another matter.

MR. SHANKER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: We were late to begin with and I should have apologized at the very outset of this hearing given the length of the prior hearing that I had, and I have been told they closed the building as of 4:00. That must be weather related.

MR. WATERSTREET: Beauty of not having any windows in here.

THE COURT: Right. But it is pretty apparent that they think the weather event is going to continue.

I'm going want to spend some time thinking about some of the arguments that I've heard today, and those comments will lead to more discussion than we have time for this afternoon, given I kept everybody here this afternoon after the building itself has been supposedly closed.

So I'm incline to say that we should put this over to conclude on another day. It would probably -- my articulation of the reasons for sentence will probably -- if we ended it this moment without hearing from the defendant, I think we would go beyond five, and we have the question of whether folks who have parked in various lots can retrieve their cars as late of 5:30. I don't know how that works. I know we have had problems with that in the past.

So I'm reluctant because I know people have taken time out of their lives to be here, hoping to see this through to a conclusion, but given the amount of time that we need to spend concluding it, and my own desire to have time to think about the arguments made on both sides, I think we should probably break and resume to conclude the sentencing hearing another day.

I'm starting a jury trial tomorrow morning, and so
I think we may have to put it over -- I don't know how
long they project that trial --

1	THE CLERK: Five full days.
2	MR. SHANKER: I will be out of town until the
3	22nd.
4	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Waterstreet?
5	MR. WATERSTREET: I did not bring my
6	calendar.
7	THE COURT: Look at the 23rd, but let us
8	know.
9	MR. WATERSTREET: The 23rd?
10	THE CLERK: A Thursday.
11	MR. WATERSTREET: I'll write it down and
12	talk
13	MR. SHANKER: I don't have my calendar here.
14	THE COURT: Give us at least a couple of
15	hours.
16	THE CLERK: Morning of the 23rd or the 27th.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Shanker, do you have a
18	preference?
19	MR. SHANKER: I have to take a look at my
20	calendar. I'm guessing the 27th is the one that works
21	better.
22	MR. WATERSTREET: In the afternoon?
23	THE CLERK: In the morning.
24	THE COURT: So we will continue with the
25	arguments and hearing on that day, and again, I'm sorry.

I don't think I realized how much material the Court would 1 2 be asked to consider, and how lengthy the arguments would 3 be, but I want to give both sides a full opportunity to say everything that they believe the Court should consider 4 5 in passing judgment on the sentence. So we'll give them that time. 6 All right. So we'll tentatively -- Mr. Shanker 7 8 you might be available on the 23rd? 9 MR. SHANKER: I think the 27th is going to be 10 better based on what I know, given I will be out of town 11 before that. 12 THE COURT: All right. Then tentatively we 13 will pick the date on the 27th at 9:30. Let me know if 14 that works. 15 MR. SHANKER: 9:30? 16 THE CLERK: Yes. 17 MR. WATERSTREET: I will contact you if I 18 have any problems. 19 THE COURT: Thanks. 20 21 (Proceedings adjourned.) 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATION

I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

s/a Ronald A. DiBartolomeo

March 20, 2017

Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR

Date

Official Court Reporter